HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 34 Saturday, August 25, 1956 Washington, D. C.

AUG 28 1956

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

From HUMAN EVENTS BUREAU — SAN FRANCISCO

Stassen: Childe Harold's obit was written by the Alsops: "Stassen was sinking into political oblivion. His action seems to have been as purely instinctive and un-thought-out as the last desperate wallowings of the moose just before the quicksand sucks it down."

Despite the fact that Stassen was treated by the delegates as if he were the village idiot, rumors persist that the ex-boy wonder, who seems to have nine political lives, will be named Ambassador to India. Nehru would welcome Stassen, whose views accord with those of two former Ambassadors to the subcontinent, Chester Bowles and John Sherman Cooper.

Nixon: The Fight to Dump Nixon has been replaced by The Fight to Take Over Nixon. The pros here are battling for inner-circle status if Nixon succeeds Ike, either during the latter's second term or by winning the Presidential nomination in 1960.

When Herter loomed as a threat, the worried Vice President turned for help to two right-wing Senators, Bridges and Knowland. Bridges, to frustrate his old enemy, former New Hampshire Governor Sherman Adams, inspired the sensational 20,000 Nixon write-in last spring in the New Hampshire primary. The two Senators went to Eisenhower at the critical moment and warned him that a ticket composed of two "liberal" Republicans would alienate large numbers of Taft and McCarthy followers. Thereupon, Ike refused to give his Eastern internationalist friends the encouragement they were expecting before putting themselves publicly behind the Herter movement.

As soon as Stassen's effort proved futile, "liberal" Republicans— some of whom had secretly hoped for its success — were eager to move in. Dewey, who with Brownell is the shrewdest behind-the-scenes manipulator in the party, has stepped out in front as a Nixon promoter. One of his first acts was to have an hour-and-a-half session with Murray Chotiner; word is that at the appropriate time, Dewey will make a statement completely exonerating Chotiner — thus solidifying his position with Nixon.

In addition, Dewey had been buttonholing his former supporters among state leaders and delegates, plugging for Nixon.

Once Ike is re-elected, his strength — because he cannot run for a third term — will begin to wane, and Nixon's, as the potential successor, will begin to grow. Objective of the Dewey wing is to put the Veep under obligations, so if he succeeds Ike they can swing him into the "liberal" camp.

1960: Prevue of the 1960 Presidential contest between Knowland and Nixon — assuming Ike is elected and lives out his term — was given in San Francisco.

Senator Knowland's address, besides eulogizing Ike, contained a tribute to the late Senator Taft. He made special mention of states' rights. The speech was frankly conservative.

Nixon was asked by NEA columnist Peter Edson whether he considered himself a Taft or Eisenhower Republican. The Vice President classified Taft as an isolationist and aligned himself with Ike. And he quoted extracts from a 1949 speech of his to prove that he is not a "Johnny-come-lately liberal."

Complacency: The complacency here over November victory — delegates continuously assuring one another that an Eisenhower landslide resembling FDR's in 1936 is in sight — is a real worry to the more astute politicians. Judging from their conversations, almost no state organization this fall will really get down to any genuine precinct-level doorbell-ringing drive of the kind that won a 400,000 majority for Taft in Ohio in 1950. Local

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

candidates seem to be counting upon Ike's coattails pulling them across the line. Meanwhile — point out the Old Hands — the Stevenson-Kefauver team is planning a ten-day whirlwind air tour leaving Monday to visit eight regional centers, solely to fire up the local workers. The AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE) has promised to deliver to the home of every union member (there are 17,000,000 of them) the 1947-56 voting record of every Senator and Representative.

Disregarding the law and in spite of the fact that about 40 per cent of union members vote Republican, the deliveries of these voting records will be made by union locals and state and local industrial councils — in the name of "political education." GOP veterans here point out that COPE's goal is to produce a pro-labor Congress — even if Ike wins — and they pessimistically say there is no program remotely resembling this in thoroughness planned to help GOP members of Congress.

Hoover to GOP: ". . . If you produce nothing but improvised platitudes, you will give no hope. If here you calculate what will please this or that minor segment of our population, and satisfy this or that pressure group or sectional interest, you will be betraying your opportunity — and tragically missing the call of your time.

"Today the greatest issue in America and all mankind is the encroachment of Government to master our lives.

"If you temporize with Socialism in any of its disguises, you will stimulate its growth and make certain the defeat of free men.

"If you follow the counsel of those who believe that politics is only a game to be played for personal advantage, you will be contributing to a decline and ultimately the fall of America."

Knowland to GOP: "No group in labor or industry has the right to strangle the economic life of 165 million Americans. It is not wise to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and leave the individual worker and small business without the protection the Act provides.

"I believe the spirit of that great Republican and American statesman, the late and highly revered Senator Bob Taft, should motivate us all in the days ahead. He knew that a party based on principle could survive temporary defeat, change of leadership or factional contests.

"The longer I have served in public life — in the State Legislature and in the United States Senate — the stronger a believer and supporter of the principle of states' rights I have become.

"As long as I have a voice and vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall oppose the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. . . . Another secret Yalta agreement with its devastating effects on the nations of Eastern Europe and Asia must never again be permitted to darken the scene of this nation's foreign policy. Nor is it wise in international affairs or partisan politics to abandon your friends and supporters to please your opponents."

Liberals on the Run: Since the "liberal" victory by which Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn upset Texas Governor Allen Shivers, conservative forces have fought back with an impressive series of victories. In seven critical struggles, conservatives have gained strength in Kentucky, Indiana, Utah, Kansas, Michigan and New York.

- In Democratic Kentucky, states' rights Governor A. B. "Happy" Chandler captured the 30-man convention delegation from the extreme left-wing segment of his party, headed by Senator Earle C. Clements.
- Senator William E. Jenner consolidated his control of Indiana's Republican party, deflating the influence of "liberal" Republican Governor George N. Craig. The party nominated Harold Handley, Jenner's candidate for governor, whom the retiring Craig had said was "unacceptable."
- Utah's J. Bracken Lee defeated a powerful array of forces both within and without his party, and triumphed in his primary bid for a third term.
- Kansas Republicans rejected the ADA-CIO idol, Governor Fred Hall, for renomination in favor of the little-known Warren Shaw, because the latter came out for the "right-to-work" bill that Hall vetoed. This was the first time in 26 years that a Kansas governor had failed win renomination.
- The ADA and organized labor forces united in special drives to defeat for renomination three incumbent Republican Representatives, each of whom voted 100 per cent against the recommendations of the ADA on seven proposals considered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the ADA to be the "test" of their brand of "liberalism." The three men were classified as "black reactionaries" who must at all cost be defeated as a demonstration of the power of the labor bosses to destroy those who defy them. All three won despite heavy expenditures against them. They were Wint Smith in Kansas, August Johansen in Michigan and Ralph Gwinn in New York state.

Civil Rights: "Moderation" was not simply a device to keep the Southern Democrats within the party — it was frequently noted by observers at the Chicago Convention. "Moderation" was also, these observers suspect, aimed at placating white elements in the North discontented with results of the "civil rights" crusade. So, at least, ran much talk at the Democratic Convention; and at the San Francisco Convention where some agreed that the GOP faced the same problem.

Certainly the atmosphere at Chicago did not suggest that the white directors of the Democratic party were frantically pushing "inter-racial levelling" in their own ranks. Negroes — as delegates and as agitators in behalf of NAACP — were present, as they have been at past conventions, but they were no more numerous than on previous occasions — so press opinion agreed. Nor, in the hotels where delegates gather, were the Negro brethren mingling socially with white delegates to any noticeable extent. At least, such social mingling seemed less frequent in Chicago than may be seen almost any day in hotels and restaurants in New York or Washington.

Additionally, the whole phenomenon of race relations in the Democratic Chicago area stood in contrast to the Democratic party leaders' extravagant oratory in behalf of desegregation. The suburb of Cicero, not many miles from the Stockyards Amphitheater is as resistant to Negro infiltration in its housing as many parts of the "racist South." The case of the Trumbull Park housing project pops up in conversation constantly as an example of the resistance of whites to desegregation; police detachments are constantly present to protect Negroes who have managed to get a foothold in that belligerently white district. Talk in Chicago revolves on whether the City authorities should not check Negro immigration (estimated at about 100 a day) by tightening up housing regulations and relief standards.

Newsmen from Philadelphia (containing one of the country's fastest growing Negro communities — now 21 per cent of the city's population) recalled that the Quaker City Muncipial Building not long ago saw an influx of whites from a certain real estate area facing "Negro invasion," who demanded that their registration be changed from Democratic to Republican. Reason: they sought continuation of housing segregation and the Democratic municipal regime had ruled against them. (The local press reported the demand for change in registration, but did not mention the underlying race question.)

Reports from Michigan serve to explain why Governor "Soapy" Williams — a firebrand four years ago for all-out civil rights — now had moderated his attitude. In the 1st Congressional District of Michigan (Detroit and Hamtramck), the recent Democratic primary split strictly on color lines. According to Hearst writer George Rothwell Brown, the district is 40 per cent Negro, 60 per cent Polish and "there is a racial tension there equal to anything to be found in Mississippi." A Polish-American won. Governor "Soapy" faces a difficult race for re-election in November.

In any case, the same observers who talked such things over in the Loop last week reiterate, on the slopes of Nob Hill, such matters in discussing Senator Dirksen's demand that the GOP go the limit with a "civil rights plan," to outbid the Democrats. But on the platform committees and subcommittees, some caution developed — for moderation is a wind blowing across the Republicans too.

How Open? In retrospect, veteran political correspondents are wondering if their eyes may not have been subjected to a wool-pulled-over-them treatment with the purportedly "free and open" nomination of Senator Estes Kefauver by the Democrats for the Vice-Presidency.

On the surface, the second ballot nomination was "free and open," as Presidential nominee Adlai Stevenson said he wanted it to be. Nevertheless, skeptics raise questions about one or two points.

Point one. When Kefauver withdrew from the Presidential race, reaction was: "There's the deal — a Stevenson-Kefauver ticket." Kefauver, Stevenson and all else concerned denied it. Yet, now the convention is over, what's the ticket?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Point two. As the millions know who watched on television, "operation big switch" took place after the second ballot was completed. Before the results were announced, Convention Chairman Speaker Sam Rayburn had the benign countenance of a disinterested spectator who simply called on each state as he saw its banner being waved for recognition. But veteran Capital reporters are well aware of Sam's ability to feign interest or lack of interest; the order in which he recognized the different states could not have been arranged better for purposes of creating a Kefauver bandwagon. So well ordered was his recognition, in fact, that whereas young Senator John Kennedy at one time was within 20½ of the 686½ needed for the nomination, by the time it was all over, he was down to 593.

This elaborate masquerade, of course, had only one purpose: to set a "precedent" that the Republicans would have to follow — by throwing their convention open to a Stassen-Nixon dogfight. But it never came off.

Labor-Bossed: The Democratic Convention was a labor-boss controlled convention. The competition for ultimate power was between United Auto Workers Chief Reuther and United Steel Workers Chief MacDonald. The latter supported Harriman and lost to Reuther, who peremptorilly ordered Michigan Governor Mennen Williams and New Jersey Governor Meyner to announce for Stevenson. (Four years ago Reuther told Alben Barkley — with a 100 per cent pro-labor record during his entire Congressional career — that he would not get labor's support for the presidency because he was "too old." Adlai, who got the 1952 nomination, thought for a few hours he won it on his own and intended to "accept the fact of Taft-Hartley." But he reversed himself when he was bluntly told "the facts of life." That willingness to take orders won Reuther's support in 1956.)

At the recent convention, when Kefauver heard Adlai's surprise announcement of the "open" convention on the Vice-Presidency, he told Mrs. K he was through; they were going home. But as they were getting ready to pack up, Reuther stopped him. Reuther was taking over.

Although the labor bosses knew the rank-and-file labor voters in the big CIO states would have preferred John Kennedy, they feared that the Massachusetts Senator might show some of the "courage" described in his book *Profiles In Courage*. To date, he has always voted pro-labor, but union chiefs prefer not to take chances. They had no doubt about "The Keef's" submissiveness. He got the nod and the Vice-Presidential nomination.

Sellout: After mentioning that House Democratic Leader John W. MacCormack's Boston district contained "no farms larger than a window box," a farm state Congressman speaking to the Democratic Convention praised him for voting in favor of every farm price-support bill. He neglected to add that these votes raised the food and tax bills of all of MacCormack's constituents — and primarily to win the Boston Congressman the position of "Majority Leader."

Democratic Convention Oratory: The Eisenhower Administration has led us into the worst crisis in our history (applause). . . . It has ruined the economy. Labor is being ground under the heel of Big Business. Farmers are starving (applause). The whole country is going down to ruin (loud applause). . . . Our foreign policy has been drifting aimlessly. America stands on the brink of destruction (cheers). The whole free world is collapsing before the challenge of Communism (applause, cheers and whistles).

Letter from AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Member of Congress from Michigan: "HUMAN EVENTS is one of the most welcome and eagerly read items of my regular mail. It provides a running account of the endless fight against too big, too costly and too powerful centralized Federal Government."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIII, No. 34 HUMAN EVENTS August 25, 1956

Article Section

A Case of DT's

HOW AMERICA GOT THE FOREIGN-AID "HABIT"

By FRANK CHODOROV

DURING his convalescence, the patient explained how he got that way. At first, he told the doctor, he indulged in social drinking only; never took a solo. But sociability made increasing demands on him, far into the night, and one morning the residual effects were distressing. Somebody suggested a bracer, before breakfast. This was quite a help. Soon, however, his morning sickness did not respond to a single slug; a double dose became a necessity, and he had to dispense with breakfast.

By noon his stomach became jittery; nothing but a shot would settle it down. Another toward the end of the afternoon set him nicely for dinner, after which sociability would take care of his discomforts. In due time food lost its allure and he learned that alcohol could supply all the sustenance he needed. All would have been well except that the steady diet of whiskey induced his present case of DT's.

And so with "foreign aid." It all began with Lend-lease, the very sociable and short-of-war toast to the nations warring in our behalf. It was a cheap investment in security. But, it was also the beginning of the habit of giving, which we could hardly stop when "perfidy" drew us into the war. Lend-lease then became a necessary cost of doing business; something like paying for mercenaries.

After the war, Lend-lease was replaced by UNRRA. This was the humanitarian thing to do — Americans are noted for their humanitarianism — and, besides, were we not under moral obligation to the people who had suffered so much from a war from which we gained so much at such small cost? The moral obligation extended to our erstwhile enemies, since we had helped to bring them to their miserable estate.

UNRRA proved to be inadequate, just like the morning-after bracer, and help to our allies had to be put on a more substantial and regularized basis. Thus came the famous (or infamous, if you wish) Marshall Plan. This did for a while, until the glamor of the giveaway show wore off; that is, the voting public stopped applauding. Interest in giving away had to be stimulated with new gags and a new name on the marquee. Thus came Point Four and the laudable purpose of bringing technocracy and democracy to the "underdeveloped" countries of the world.

The script-writers also introduced a radical change in the plot. A villain was introduced, so the paying gallery could catcall and boo, and thus get a thrill for their money. The suddenly discovered shenanigans of our former peace-loving ally — who was just as communistic when he was helping us win the war — made him the perfect villain. Unless we saved the fair damsel — that is, the "underdeveloped" countries of the world — he would force her (or them) into unholy wedlock. Saving meant giving.

Pretty soon the taxpayers lost interest in the "underdeveloped" countries gag. Why? It developed that while these countries accepted

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our gifts eagerly, even started demanding them, their favor went to the ugly monster from Moscow, not to us; that even our allies were flirting with him and giving us a grudging smile for our billions; that "foreign aid" wound up in supporting such semi-communistic schemes as free wigs and nationalized industries; that some of it was spent on wars against "underdeveloped" countries. Something had to be done to make the taxpayers like "foreign aid" — for spending had become a confirmed American habit.

So, the part of the villain was built up into a menace to our sacred institutions, including our way of life. This was not hard to do since, as anybody who was not illiterate should have known, he had always been a sworn enemy of our way of life, even when we were sending him Lend-lease billions. Anyhow, now he could be trotted out on the stage as the "enemy"; the gallery would certainly applaud "billions for defense." Now "foreign aid" has become in part "military aid" and in part "economic aid," with the implication that all of it would win powerful allies in the event of war. Spending cannot be stopped.

In fact, we are now told that it will never be stopped, or at least for a long, long time. The script-writers are presently working on a new plot, something that will fit the title of "long-range commitments." In short, we are being prepared for a steady diet of giving.

THE alcoholic traced his plight to a penchant for sociability; the doctors usually find a deeper cause. In like manner, our habit of giving away our substance, which has already cost us over fifty billions, originated in something else than the need of buying up allies or helping "underdeveloped" countries. The "reasons" advanced by the check-writers have worn exceedingly thin, and it is about time we who have to feed the kitty looked for the real cause of this continuing draught on our resources.

Let's go back to the beginning of our spending spree. It all started, modestly enough, like the first potation at the cocktail party, during the depression. Up to that time it had been held, by both economists and sensible people, that spending was the way to poverty, not riches; that when you go broke the way to get out of the situation is to go to work, make a dollar and save some of it. That was orthodoxy: produce and save.

The depression, however, brought to the front a new crop of doctors of economics, who held that this go-to-work theory was outmoded, fallacious. The true way, they said, for a nation to achieve opulence is to spend itself into it. The professors had picked up this novel theory from a fellow named Keynes, who wrote a whole book about it; the book was very erudite, replete with calculus, and therefore the professors, who never raised a hog or made a pair of shoes, were convinced that the fellow's theory was as sound as it was new. They were for it.

President Roosevelt, who knew nothing about economics, or anything else (except how to be elected to office), was looking around for something to do about the depression; if the thing continued the chances of being re-elected would be slim. Somebody told him about the brand new theory. So he promptly called in a batch of these professors to tell him all about it. The professors, delighted with the opportunity to escape from their dim ivory towers into the sunshine of public affairs, not only explained the theory but also told him how to put it into practice. Spend, they said, and keep on spending until the cows — that is, jobs and plenty — come home.

But, what to spend on? Make work, said the professors, any kind of work, even moving dirt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from one side of the road to the other. And thus came WPA, PWA and a host of other alphabetized projects that kept people busy and cost money. There was a hitch; since the country was poor and not producing much, the President could hardly get enough in taxes to pay for these costly operations. The professors, who had read Keynes thoroughly, were ready with a solution: print money. But, the gold standard made it illegal to print money indiscriminately. Illegalize the law, said the professors. Fine, said the President, and so one bright morning the country was told that gold would hereafter be of no account, that the government would not permit the yellow metal to stop the wheels of progress, meaning the printing press.

That's how spending started, in 1933. The purpose then was to cure the country of *ennui,* induced by unemployment, and to put dollar bills into heretofore empty pockets. "Happy days" were here again — even though by the legerdemain of inflation the ten-cent sandwich soon cost a quarter. Somehow, however, things did not go as per the professors' predictions, and by 1937, when Roosevelt totted up his accounts, he found the depression still on his hands. You did not spend enough, said the professors, and their diagnosis was supported by the great Keynes himself, who had been imported by Roosevelt for consultation.

About this time a clever fellow in Roosevelt's entourage discovered a new reason for spending; his name was Hopkins, and he put his discovery into a neat formula that was music to his chief's ears: tax, spend, and elect. It sounded like a sure-fire recipe. Yet, there was still the problem of finding something on which to spend in ever-increasing amounts. The professors' make-work projects were at best temporary and not costly enough.

While pondering over this problem, Roosevelt was presented with a solution by a crazy paper hanger named Hitler, who was fixing to get all Europe embroiled in a war. Now, where can a country spend more money than on a project of that kind? The trouble was that this country was not war-minded — for twenty years it had been fed a fare of pacifism — and there did not seem to be any logical way to get us into war, at that time.

By 1939 — the depression being still with us — Hitler's fracas was well under way, and it was quite obvious to Roosevelt (if to nobody else) that we would get into it. The trouble was that the people were not convinced that Hitler intended to attack Coney Island. It would take a Pearl Harbor to convince them. In the meantime, he could do a bit of spending, as "insurance," by helping the anti-Hitler forces. Thus came Lend-lease, which was the forerunner of our "foreign aid" policy.

HOPKINS' formula kept Roosevelt in the White House until nature called a halt, and since then, it has become an infallible principle of politics; no candidate for office in these United States, from city councilman up, has questioned the validity of "tax, spend, and elect." For that reason, "foreign aid," along with other spending schemes, has become the national diet. When the American appetite rebels against the monotony, it is only necessary to change the name of the fodder, or to serve it with a different garnish; the spending must not stop.

But, why is the Hopkins' formula so politically potent? Simply because the dollars appropriated for "foreign aid" remain in American pockets; only goods go abroad. Even the few dollars that foreigners lay their hands on come back to claim American products, for dollars cannot buy anything in other countries. When Congress appropriates some millions for a grain elevator for India, the Indians get the elevator,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the steel, cement and other materials that go into the structure are produced in American factories which means that Americans get wages and dividends; the Indian workers employed on the job are paid in rupees, not dollars, and the dollars that were exchanged for rupees drift back to Pittsburgh and Podunk, where they become more wages and dividends.

That is to say, "foreign aid" is in fact American aid. It keeps American industry going, and American industrialists are all for it. So are the politicians who thrive on "good times" and, of course, the bureaucrats whose business it is to give the money away. Altogether, a powerful vested interest, composed of a variety of elements, is solidly behind "foreign aid," and anyone who seriously attacks it is as welcome as a teetotaler at a cocktail party.

Well then, maybe the professors who got the whole thing started in 1933 were right. Maybe the way to get rich is to spend yourself into wealth. There certainly is a lot of money running loose in the country, wages are plentiful, dividends are good and stenographers have bank accounts. If that's what "foreign aid" has done for us, why not continue it indefinitely?

Why not? For the same reason that the steady diet of alcohol eventually put the fellow into the hospital. Our spending spree is bound to bring on consequences similar to the DT's. And that brings us to a peculiar characteristic of the human being, of which the American is a good example.

The American certainly likes dollars, but he likes things more; in fact, when you get right down to it, he wants dollars only because they fetch him things. Now, "foreign aid," as we said, gives him dollars but sends the things he makes abroad; it makes for a scarcity of things. One doesn't have to take a course in economics to know that scarcity causes prices to rise, and if the scarcity is accompanied by an increase in the dollars bidding for the scarce things, the prices go still higher. Thus we have an explanation for the miracle of the sandwich: in 1933 it cost a dime, during the war it went to a quarter, and now it takes a half dollar to get it. That's what "foreign aid" has helped to do.

So long as we have the half dollar in our pockets we don't mind the price. But, suppose the half dollar brings us only half a sandwich — that is, the price goes to a dollar. Or, suppose to get the same amount of nutriment we have to buy two sandwiches, the bread having been cut thinner, the meat content reduced, the lettuce and pickle removed. Suppose the manufacture of dollars — thanks to "foreign aid" and other spending sprees — continues at a rate that no matter how many of them we have we are unable to live in the manner to which we have become accustomed.

That's when the DT's will show up. Somebody — just a sensible guy, not a professor of economics — suddenly discovers that his wheelbarrow of dollars isn't enough. He writes a letter to the editor about it, and so does everybody else. Since the editor cannot do a thing about the price of a sandwich, the letter writers get real sore and set up a howl. In fact, the would-be eater refuses to take any more dollars and insists that he be paid for his services in sandwiches. At that point, the whole nation will start acting like the alcoholic in the ward.

When will that happen? When we are all pushing wheelbarrows full of dollars. Meanwhile, let's have another shot of "foreign aid."

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED